

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 2, 22, and 38 are revised in view of the references cited in the last Office Action. Claims 17-21 are amended for proper dependency. Claims 2 and 4-38 remain, with no claim currently allowed.

Claims 2, 5-11, 13, 15-20, 22-32, 35, and 38 are rejected as anticipated by newly-cited *Martensson* (U.S. Patent No. 6,349,212). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to independent claims 2, 22, and 38 and the claims depending therefrom.

Martensson discloses a cordless telephone arrangement comprising a PBX base station and plural cordless handsets. The handsets lack a conventional keypad, comprising only a "Talk" key 7 (Fig. 1), or alternatively containing a visual display 16 and scroll buttons 17a, 17b (Fig. 2). The embodiment of Fig. 1 includes voice control communication between the mobile units and the base station, so that a user can speak a desired number or preprogrammed name into the remote unit and a voice synthesizer in the base station will return messages to the handset. In *Martensson's* embodiment of Fig. 2, the visual display and scrolls buttons replace voice communication between remote units and the PBX station, which is neither capable of generating voice messages nor of understanding spoken commands (column 6, lines 12-14).

Independent Claim 1, in contrast with *Martensson*, defines a method of making a hands-free mobile telephone call at a mobile telephone. That claimed method comprises, among other recited steps, sending a wireless signal from a satellite remote to the mobile telephone to make the mobile telephone call. The satellite remote is operable

to access an electronic telephone directory, to search and to select an entry in that directory, and to send the signal to the mobile telephone to make the call.

Claim 2 thus defines a method including sending a wireless signal from a satellite remote to a mobile telephone, to perform functions recited in that claim. *Martensson*, in contrast with the method defined by Claim 2, does not involve or use a satellite remote and a mobile telephone. *Martensson's* handsets function to communicate with a PBX base station, and the mobile stations 2a, 2b, ... are in the form of portable handset extensions including a speaker 5 and the microphone 6 for communicating with a call initiated or received by the base station (column 3, lines 46-48). If those handsets are considered comparable to a subset of the mobile telephone used with the method of Claim 2, *Martensson* nonetheless lacks a satellite remote as well as the functions recited in Claim 2 for that remote and the mobile telephone. Accordingly, *Martensson* cannot anticipate Claim 2 nor the claims depending therefrom.

Dependent Claim 5 adds that the satellite remote includes a scrolling device for searching through the electronic telephone directory and sending a signal to select an entry in that directory. *Martensson* (Fig. 2) shows a modified embodiment of his cordless telephone arrangement in which the handsets comprise a visual display and a pair of scroll buttons. However, that embodiment lacks a voice synthesizer or a voice recognition unit in the PBX base station. According to *Martensson*, the scroll buttons and visual display are an alternative replacing voice communication (column 6, lines 11-14). Claim 5, in contrast with *Martensson*, recites both the use of a scrolling device and (through parent Claim 2) generating an audible announcement of the entry in the

electronic telephone directory. Because *Martensson* fails to embody both those elements, that reference cannot anticipate Claim 5.

Independent Claim 22 defines a mobile communication system for communicating with a mobile telephone. This system comprises an electronic telephone directory, a satellite remote having at least one means for scrolling through the electronic telephone directory, means for audibly announcing a party to be called, and means for sending a signal from the satellite remote to the mobile telephone to access the electronic telephone directory.

Although *Martensson* does not disclose a satellite remote communicating with a mobile telephone, that reference does disclose a cordless handset (Fig. 2) having scroll buttons and communicating with a PBX base station. However, as mentioned above, that embodiment of *Martensson* excludes a voice synthesizer or a voice recognition unit in his PBX station, and that station cannot generate or understand voice messages (column 6, lines 11-14). Accordingly, *Martensson* cannot anticipate the system comprising the elements of Claim 22 or any claim depending thereon.

Independent Claim 38 defines a mobile communications system for use with a mobile telephone. That system comprises an electronic telephone directory, a satellite remote having a scroll wheel or scrolling through the directory, and an electronic voice generator for audibly announcing a party to be called. As pointed out above, *Martensson* teaches *either* voice communication between a cordless handset and a base station, *or* a visual display and scroll buttons on the cordless remote instead of voice communication with the PBX station. Accordingly, the system of Claim 38 is not anticipated by *Martensson*.

Claims 4, 36, and 37 are rejected as unpatentable over *Martensson* in view of *Tsai* (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,676). The Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection. **With regard to Claim 4**, the satellite remote comprises a pad located such that a user may operate the satellite remote using the user's foot. *Tsai*, by contrast, discloses a dial communication system mounted on a steering wheel and communicating with a conventional mobile telephone. Nothing in *Tsai* discloses or suggests using a satellite remote comprising a pad located such that a user may operate the satellite remote using the user's foot. Accordingly, Claim 4 is patentable over the applied references.

Claims 36 and 37 are patentable over *Martensson* in view of *Tsai* for the reasons discussed above with respect to parent Claim 22. That parent claim defines a system comprising a satellite remote having at least one means for scrolling through an electronic telephone directory, and means for audibly announcing a party to be called. However, *Martensson* teaches that a cordless remote may communicate with a base station either with voice recognition and a voice synthesizer or scroll controls. Accordingly, that reference would teach one of ordinary skill away from the combination defined by Claims 36 and 37.

Claims 12, 14, 21, 33, and 34 are rejected as unpatentable over *Martensson* in view of *Stanley* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0068605). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. The secondary reference *Stanley* is cited as showing equivalence between signaling using infrared, RF, and direct wire connections; and disclosing a speaker or earphone to permit a user to hear an audible announcement. However, Claims 12, 14, and 21 depend from Claim 2, and Claims 33 and 34 depend from Claim 22. As pointed out above, Claims 2 and 22 are not anticipated by *Martensson*, and for the same


S/N 10/013,092

reason those parent claims would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill based on *Martensson*. Adding the equivalencies for which *Stanley* was cited would not overcome the elements missing in *Martensson*, nor was *Stanley* cited for that purpose. Accordingly, the claims rejected as unpatentable over *Martensson* in view of *Stanley* are patentable over that combination of art.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD


Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: June 16, 2005

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

